



Plan Commission Minutes
June 20, 2022 at 7:00 p.m.
City Hall Council Chambers

Commission Members Present: Christopherson, Granlund, Erickson, Obaid, Wolfgram, Davis, Helgeson, Johnson and Brandvold

Staff Members Present: Wittwer, Allen, Hufford, Hirsch, White, Pempek

1. Call to Order – Chairperson Granlund called the Plan Commission meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
2. Roll Call – Chairperson Granlund called the roll for the meeting. Commissioners Christopherson, Granlund, Erickson, Obaid, Wolfgram, Davis, Helgeson, Johnson and Brandvold were present.
3. Commissioner Christopherson moved to approve the meeting minutes of June 6, 2022. Commissioner Helgeson seconded and the motion carried unanimously.
4. Open public comment period for items that do not appear on this agenda noted as public hearings. None.
5. Recognition of Outgoing Plan Commission Member Seymour and Introduction of New Plan Commission Member Davis. Mr. Seymour shared comments and thanks to the Commission and to staff for the past 8 years of service on the Commission.
6. Rezoning (Z-1709-22) – C-2P & C-3 to C-3P
Site Plan (SP-2214) – 7Brew Coffee Shop
Mr. Allen presented the rezoning request and approval of the site plan. Applicant is the BFA, Inc. and the owner is NLD Acquisitions. Current zoning is C-2P & C-3. 7Brew Coffee will be developed on the property. The Comprehensive Plan shows the area as commercial. Currently residential and residential displacement will occur with this request. Mr. Allen reviewed the site plan, traffic circulation, and patio seating. Development will need to add bicycle parking and pedestrian access. CSM and development agreement will occur at a later date. Mr. Allen reviewed conditions of approval including abbreviated traffic impact analysis.

The Commission asked questions of staff:

How many tenant units will be displaced? 2-3 currently occupied.

Will traffic analysis consider better access to area? T.I.A. is still in process.

Is there a review of drivers who cut through area? Trips will be looked at and where coming from and going to.

Mark Huonder, Net Lease Development (NLD) Acquisitions, explained the 7Brew concept being primary drive-up service and the site is being developed for that. Attendants will greet cars and deliver coffee to cars.

Commissioner Wolfgram asked if there has been any discussion about assistance to relocate occupants. Mr. Huonder explained he would need to follow up after speaking to seller.

No public comments.

Commissioner Helgeson moved to approve the rezoning and site plan with staff recommendations. Commissioner Wolfgram seconded.

Commissioner Christopherson stated she would support without reservation, as this project provides an additional coffee user in the neighborhood.

Motion carried unanimously.

7. Rezoning (Z-1710-22) – I-1P to R-3P

Mr. Allen presented the rezoning request. Mr. Allen noted he did receive a phone call asking general questions about the project. The proposed project will include 3 multi-family buildings with a mixture of unit types. At least ten units will be at or below 60% of area median income due to development agreement on City owned property. Landscaping and driveways will create buffer with neighboring industrial area. Comprehensive Plan shows the area as transitional.

The Commission asked questions of staff:

Will on-street parking be restricted near access driveways? It has not been discussed, but would require ordinance change.

Is the view of development close to what final development will look like? Applicant will have to come forward with final site plan and renderings.

Lee Haremza, RyKey Properties, explained that the 18-unit building will include the units below or at 60% of AMI. The rent roll will be shared every year showing 10 units per agreement with City. Onsite parking will provide more than enough parking for development and should limit on-street parking. There was a discussion of what the façades will look like.

Commissioner Wolfgram commented that follow-up and reporting of affordable housing is welcomed and will be a template for future developers. Commissioner Wolfgram asked for consideration of allowing lower than 60% of AMI.

The Commission asked questions of the applicant:

What are planned rents for market rate units? It has not been decided at this time but intend on being within workforce housing ranges.

Any sustainable features or electric charging stations? Yes, have been adding charging stations to current developments, usually 4 per building, including e-bike charging stations.

What is the phasing plan? 18-unit will be built first (with 10 affordable units).

The Commission noted liking the community building aspects in design and discussed green space.

No public comments.

Commissioner Helgeson moved to recommend approval of the rezoning and general development plan as presented. Commissioner Wolfgram seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

8. Rezoning (Z-1526-13 Amd) – Aspen Meadows II

Mr. Allen explained the rezoning amendment request. The request is for a proposal to develop a single-family home. It will remain R-2P zoning, but changes the redevelopment plan to allow one single-family lot. Grading and erosion control plans will need to be submitted. Staff discussed slopes and buildable areas allowing for the building of a home.

The Commission asked questions of staff:

Can staff discuss the neighbor email about concerns that site would not be developed and concerns over slope and wooded area? Modification is significant enough to warrant recommendation by Plan Commission and approval by Council.

Will the proposed development change the street intersection? It would not. Improvements would be made at planned road development period.

Sean Bohan, AEC as applicant on behalf of the owner CMJM Properties, explained concerns with slope and buildable areas that are available for the development of one single-family home. Owner does not object to staff recommendations if approved.

The Commission asked questions of the applicant:

What is the grade of driveway and does it fall within City allowance? Would fall within allowances with variance.

Can you speak to the neighbor email concern regarding stormwater with removal of trees from the property? Applicant explained infrastructure in place for stormwater. Will look at a couple of options to help prevent erosion and will provide engineering plan to show concern will be addressed if approved.

How much of the wooded area would be removed? Would clear enough for the driveway and home area with some yard. Steep slopes would remain wooded. Maybe 15%-17% with driveway and home.

Will area look be altered much? Property has been reviewed for the best location for the driveway and will try to retain as many trees as possible. With intentions to keep as many trees as possible, home should not be visible.

Public comments:

Kathy Ryder, 6251 Aspen Meadow Ct., raised concerns about losing trees on the property considering other developments by applicant. Seeing that the development will be one house, not as concerned with tree removal, but asked for as many trees as possible to be retained and contours to remain.

Mary Sanford, 6143 Aspen Meadow Ct., spoke opposing the development. Realtor promised that the property would not be built on and feels the verbal contract is a violation of their home sale. Concerns about current slopes and it is not developable. Intersection is dangerous and does not meet intersection sight guidelines, asked to be addressed immediately. Concerned about water running down driveway to their property. Mentioned some neighbors were not directly notified about meeting, including next door neighbor at 6145 Aspen Meadow Ct. Further discussed concerns with safety of intersection after question from Commissioner. Many pedestrians walk/bike to the ballfields with no acceptable walkway. Further discussed concerns with runoff after being asked to elaborate by Commissioner.

Steve Wells, 6194 Aspen Meadow Ct., spoke opposing the development. Realtor told them the lot would not be built on. After buying home they had flooding issues in the basement and stated C&M told them when building the company would address if there were any issues. Discussed report explaining how runoff should occur and concerns how runoff will occur and may lead to more flooding issues. Requesting something in writing to ensure there would not be any runoff issues.

Scott Munden, 6196 Aspen Meadow Ct., spoke opposing the development. Realtor told them the lot would not be developed. Incident mentioned by Mr. Wells also impacted speaker incurring about \$5,000 in damages. Ditch added to area has removed the flooding problems.

Applicant responded to speakers at the request of the Commission. Trees within the steep slopes would remain with the exception of area for the driveway. Staff recommendation for sidewalk would be along curb to keep out of steeper slopes. Can add a curb to help direct runoff from the driveway into the storm sewer. Area that will be cleared for home would not impact drainage to the homes to the north as property north of house between other properties is a higher elevation. Driveway does meet sight distances required by the City.

Commissioners asked about representation that land would not be developed by realtor and would there be a guarantee that drainage issues that could occur? Applicant is not the owner and could not speak to a guarantee. Design is for a 100-year storm event and pipes for a ten-year storm event.

Could the intentions expressed be put in writing in amended development plan? Yes, if the City wants to make it a condition of the development agreement (regarding tree removal and runoff).

Commissioner Helgeson moved to recommend approval of the development plan with additional development plan conditions. Commissioner Wolfgram seconded.

Motion by Commissioner Erickson to amend the original motion, to divert runoff from home away from the driveway. Commissioner Wolfgram seconded. Amendment passed unanimously.

Original motion with amendment passed on a vote of 6 yes and 3 no (Christopherson, Obaid, Brandvold).

9. Tax Incremental District (TID) #15

Mr. White presented the City's TID creation request and explained land uses and proposed infrastructure upgrades. This would be a 20 year mixed use TID. Mr. White discussed project costs of infrastructure and presented increment charts and return on funding, noting the table will be adjusted before going to Council due to a project that will be put on hold.

No questions of staff from the Commission.

No public comments.

Commissioner Erickson moved to recommend approval of the TID. Commissioner Helgeson seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

10. Conditional Use Permit (CZ-2210) – Hope Gospel Mission
Site Plan (SP-2215) – Expansion

Ms. Hufford presented expansion of existing program that was approved in 2017.

Craig Pedersen, Hope Gospel Mission Operations Director, shared that expansion will add to existing bed space allowing for more area for beds and social area.

The Commission asked how is emergency housing supported during the day? Residents are worked with to develop a program to transition into housing or as applicants to the program. Residents are in school, at job training, or work at existing jobs. Neighbors that expressed concerns four years ago did not have concerns with this expansion.

No public comments.

Commissioner Helgeson moved to recommend approval of the CUP and site plan.
Commissioner Wolfgram seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

11. Future Agenda Items and Announcements – Next meeting is cancelled (July 4th). July 18th will be next scheduled meeting.
12. The meeting adjourned at 8:48 p.m.



Zina Obaid, Secretary